

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.webje.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/525,095	07/20/2005	Jeremy Bowman	09294-020US1	3292	
26161 FISH & RICH	7590 06/08/2009 ARDSON PC	EXAMINER			
P.O. BOX 102	2	WOOD, ELLEN S			
MINNEAPOL	IS, MN 55440-1022		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1794		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/08/2009	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Ī	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/525,095	BOWMAN, JEREMY		
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	ELLEN S. WOOD	1794		

	ELLEN S. WOOD	1794						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 22 May 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.						
 Al The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	, or other evidence, with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request					
 a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date 	of the final rejection.							
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO							
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date		36(a) and the annronriat	e extension fee					
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.176; is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (0) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as					
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp.	liance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be f	iled within two months	s of the date of					
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the						
AMENDMENTS								
3. Me proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) Mey raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);								
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or		lucing or simplifying t	ne issues for					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		cted claims.						
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1								
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 		npliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).					
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all 		imely filed amendmen	at canceling the					
non-allowable claim(s).	_	•						
 For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: 		be entered and an e	xplanation of					
Claim(s) allowed:								
Claim(s) objected to:								
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu	before or on the date of filing a No	tice of Appeal will not	be entered					
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a					
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 	n of the status of the claims after er	try is below or attach	ed.					
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:					
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)							
/Rena L. Dye/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1794								

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The applicant removes the types of adhesion-reducing additives and amends to state that the additive is "an ester of a polyhydric alcohol," which raises new issues and would require a further searchand consideration. The final rejection was based on other additives disclosed by applicant.

The applicant has failed to address the 35 U.S.C 112, second paragraph, rejection of claim 4.

Examiner notes that while Toyosumi et al. do not disclose all the features of the present claimed invention, Toyosumi et al. is used as teaching reference, and therefore, it is not necessary for this secondary reference to contain all the features of the presently claimed invention, In re Nievelt, 482 F.2d 965, 179 USPQ 224, 226 (CCPA 1973), In re Keller 624 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871, 881 (CCPA 1981). Rather this reference teaches a certain concept, namely, that adhesion-reducing additives are added to polymeric material to provide lubrication. In order to (motivation) and in combination with the primary reference, discloses the presently claimed invention.